

Claims 24-26, 30-32, 38-40, 43, 44, 46, 51, 64-66, 74, 79, and 80 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,301,881 (Fukatsu) in combination with U.S. Patent No. 4,370,649 (Fuerle). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

As recited in independent Claim 24, the present invention includes, *inter alia*, the features of inputting price information provided via a network along with electronic information by an information provider terminal, the price information indicating a charge for use of the electronic content information. Applicant submits that the cited art fails to disclose or suggest at least this feature.

Fukatsu discloses a POS (point of sale) system that, as shown in Fig. 15, includes a mainframe computer 155, a cash register 100, and a host computer 159. The cash register is connected to each of the computers 155 and 159. The function of the disclosed system is cash management of sales transactions at, for example, department stores, supermarkets, and the like. In the system disclosed in Fukatsu, electronic information is not provided via a network by an information provider terminal, and price information indicating a charge for use of electronic information is not provided via a network along with the electronic information.

The Office Action concedes that Fukatsu does not disclose at least the feature of inputting price information provided via a network along with electronic information by an information provider terminal, said price information indicating a charge for use or the electronic information. However, the Office Action asserts that Fuerle discloses that feature.

Applicant respectfully submits that Fuerle does not does disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned claim feature, and therefore that patent adds nothing to the teachings of

Fukatsu that would render obvious the present invention. The Office Action cites specifically to column 2, lines 14-31 of Fuerle as allegedly disclosing the above-mentioned claim feature.

However, the cited text merely discloses that a “system builder” can calculate expenses, including central processor time and number of phone calls, to more readily plan a system. Different usage rates can be charged for display terminals that update information at different rates. For example, a significantly higher price may be charged for a terminal that is updated at five minute intervals or upon every change of data than the price charged for a terminal that displays information updated only hourly. Thus, Applicant submits that the cited portion of Fuerle only discloses that different prices may be charged for different terminals, and it does not disclose or suggest that price information is provided via a network along with electronic information. Moreover, Applicant submits that the prices mentioned in Fuerle are prices for the use of *terminals*, depending on the rate the displayed data is updated, and not price information indicating a charge for use of the electronic information.

Applicant submits that the remaining portions of Fuerle also fail to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned feature. Fig. 4, for example, discloses that when money is deposited a decision is made as to whether enough money has been paid for the selected information to be displayed. However, Applicant submits that Fuerle fails to disclose or suggest inputting price information provided via a network along with electronic information by an information provider terminal, the price information indicating a charge for use of the electronic information.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that Fuerle does not remedy the deficiencies of Fukatsu and that the present invention recited in independent Claim 24 is patentable over the cited art, whether it is considered individually or in combination.

Independent Claims 46 and 64 recite features similar to Claim 24 and are believed patentable for reasons similar to Claim 24. The dependent claims are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the claims they depend from, as well as for the additional features they recite.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the outstanding rejection, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Brian L. Klock
Registration No. 36,570

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
BLK/mls

DC_MAIN 213456v1